

many of the Democratic members of the committee; they are shared by the administration; and I think it's likely that we will see some amendments to ensure that consumers are not gouged by monopolies until a competitive alternative is available.

But despite my reservations about this provision, I expect that we will be able to resolve our differences here in a manner comparable to the way we have developed a consensus on the other provisions of this bill. In that regard, I would like to commend both Chairman BLILEY and Chairman FIELDS for the manner in which they have treated the Democrats during the drafting process. This has been a truly bipartisan process, and the legislative text that was introduced today reflects the many compromises and changes that were made by both sides.

Telecommunications issues have never been partisan, and have never been ideological. The manner in which the majority has treated the minority in this case is exemplary, and it is my hope that it will serve as a model for the many legislative initiatives we have before us. I would like to thank both of these fine legislators, and look forward to continuing this bipartisan approach as H.R. 1555 moves through the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1555 is a good bill, and before it is sent to the President for his signature, it will be a better bill. I urge my colleagues to join with us in support of this legislation, and enact a statute that will enable the telecommunications industries to bring to the American people the benefits that the twenty-first century has to offer.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform Members about the introduction of the Commerce Committee's historic legislation to reshape our Nation's telecommunications laws.

I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and commend Commerce Committee Chairman BLILEY, Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee Chairman FIELDS, and ranking members JOHN DINGELL and ED MARKEY for their efforts to produce a bipartisan bill.

The Nation cannot wait another year for telecommunications reform. The current law of the land for telecommunications is based on a law written in the 1800's to govern railroads in America. Now, after several decades of extraordinary advances in information technology, most of our Nation's telephone system consists of a pair of copper wires.

As the Representative from Silicon Valley in California, I know the importance of deregulation to computer and software technology. Information technologies are the business of Silicon Valley.

I believe we can look to the computer and software industries as examples of good things to come for the communications industry if competition can be established.

Consider the first digital computer made in 1943 which was 8 feet high, 50 feet long, contained 500 miles of wire, and could perform about three additions per second. Today, consumers can purchase a computer with wafer-thin microprocessors which are capable of hundreds of millions of additions per second and fit on your lap.

Yet today's twisted copper wire telephone network is unsuitable for modern computers and software applications which can incorporate voice, video, graphic, and data trans-

missions and send them simultaneously in real-time exchanges.

A technology gap exists between the information technology and communications industries and this hurts our international competitiveness. This bill can help close the gap, encourage competition, and foster increases in high technology exports and jobs.

A successful telecommunications bill should pass two critical tests. First, it should establish a process which brings the greatest competition to bear, and second, it should promote technology innovation and production in a way that can make a difference in peoples' lives.

This bill is a step forward in meeting these important goals and I'm proud to cosponsor it.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the House has a unique opportunity during this Congress to take important and long-overdue steps to modernize the U.S. financial services system and prepare it for the competitive challenges of the 21st century.

In 1991, I served as chair of the Banking Committee's Task Force on the International Competitiveness of U.S. Financial Institutions. That task force concluded that our financial services policy had failed to keep pace with new market developments, including changes in corporate and individual consumer needs, new technology and product innovation. The result was a financial services system that was potentially uncompetitive, inefficient, unduly expensive, and slow to respond to changing customer demands.

The task force report concluded that it was incumbent upon policymakers to undertake a fundamental and comprehensive reassessment of the major laws and the regulatory structure which underpin the U.S. financial system. There have been several abortive efforts since that time to do so. But I believe we have now finally achieved substantial consensus that change is necessary, the circumstances are now ripe for meaningful action, and the goal is within our reach.

The chairmen of both the House and Senate Banking Committees have put forward comprehensive reform proposals. While these proposals differ in important regards, they share many key

elements. The Treasury Department has put forward a proposal of its own that is substantively comparable in many critical respects. In addition, the affected industries are engaged in meaningful and substantive discussions on the key issues in an effort to achieve some consensus.

While differences in perspective certainly exist, what is most noteworthy is the widely shared assumption that our financial services system requires substantial reinvention. If we can keep our eye on this shared goal, we should be able to build upon the many points on which we all agree and effect reasonable compromise where we do not in the days ahead.

To that end, while I have very definite ideas of my own as to the best course of action on key issues, I do not plan to introduce legislation at this point. A Banking Committee markup is imminent, and we will be working from the chairman's mark—which is still in preparation—as is appropriate. I believe our best prospect of success lies in working cooperatively and in a spirit of compromise to further refine that mark in a way that builds consensus on these important issues. Past experience should certainly have taught us that legislation which does not reflect a reasonably broad consensus is doomed to failure.

#### I. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE DELIBERATIONS

I would, however, like to set forth some principles which I believe should guide our deliberations.

(A) Congress should attempt to achieve the broadest reform possible;

(B) Elimination of the barrier between commercial and investment banking should be accomplished so as to maximize efficiencies and take advantage of possible synergies between lines of business, while safeguarding safety and soundness;

(C) Reform should create a true two-way street between banks and securities firms, level the competitive playing field, and provide such firms equal opportunity to enter each other's businesses;

(D) Nothing we do should turn the clock back or impose new restrictions where none are warranted;

(E) Safeguarding consumer rights and interests should be an integral part of any reform package;

(F) Proper regulatory oversight should emphasize functional regulation, ensure necessary political accountability, and take advantage of the benefits provided by a creative tension between regulators; and

(G) Reform should ensure that foreign banks have a fair opportunity to compete on equal terms, and are not competitively disadvantaged.

#### II. THE MAJOR ISSUES

##### A. The need for broad reform:

It is imperative that we strive for the broadest financial services reform on which it is possible to achieve consensus. This is not a time to be timid.